



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION  
OF THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of Michael Pelliccio,  
Fire Captain (PM1019V),  
Bayonne

CSC Docket No. 2019-2340

Examination Appeal

**ISSUED:** April 29, 2019 (RE)

Michael Pelliccio appeals his score for the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Captain (PM1019V), Bayonne. It is noted that the appellant passed the subject examination with a final average of 84.210 and ranks 18<sup>th</sup> on the resultant eligible list.

This two-part examination consisted of a written multiple-choice portion and an oral portion. Candidates were required to pass the written portion of the examination, and then were ranked on their performance on both portions of the examination. The test was worth 80 percent of the final score and seniority was worth the remaining 20 percent. Of the test weights, 31.35% of the score was the written multiple-choice portion, 22.49% was the technical score for the evolving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the evolving exercise, 4.28% was the oral communication score for the evolving exercise, 19.23% was the technical score for the arriving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the arriving exercise, and 7.59% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise.

The oral portion of the Fire Captain examination consisted of two scenarios: a fire scene simulation with questions designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of fire fighters and the ability to assess fire conditions and hazards in an evolving incident on the fireground (evolving); and a fire scene simulation designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of firefighters and the ability to plan strategies and tactics based upon a building's structure and condition (arriving). Knowledge of supervision was measured by

questions in both scenarios, and was scored for each. For the evolving scenario, candidates were provided with a 15-minute preparation period, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond. For the arriving scenario, a five-minute preparation period was given, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond.

The candidates' responses were scored on technical knowledge and oral communication ability. Prior to the administration of the exam, a panel of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) determined the scoring criteria, using generally approved fire command practices, firefighting practices, and reference materials. Scoring decisions were based on SME-approved possible courses of action (PCAs) including those actions that must be taken to resolve the situation as presented. Only those oral responses that depicted relevant behaviors that were observable and could be quantified were assessed in the scoring process.

Candidates were rated on a five-point scale, with 5 as the optimal response, 4 as a more than acceptable passing response, 3 as a minimally acceptable passing response, 2 as a less than acceptable response, and 1 as a much less than acceptable response. For each of the scenes, and for oral communication, the requirements for each score were defined.

For the evolving scenario, the appellant scored a 2 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. For the arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 3 for the technical component, a 5 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his score for the supervision component of the arriving scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenarios were reviewed.

The arriving scenario involved a report of fire at a barbecue restaurant, one employee is missing, and the hood suppression system has failed. Question 1 asked candidates to use proper radio protocols to perform initial report upon arrival, while question 2 asked for specific actions to be taken after making this initial report.

For the technical component, the assessor noted that the appellant failed to announce in his initial radio report that one person is missing, which was a mandatory response to the first question. It was also noted that he missed the opportunity to announce an offensive attack, which was an additional response to question 1. The assessor used the "flex rule" to assign a score of 3. On appeal, the appellant argues that he said he was conducting an offensive attack when stretching the hoseline, and his actions were consistent with an offensive attack.

Regarding the flex rule, mandatory responses are responses that are requirements for a performance to be acceptable (a score of 3). Sometimes, a

candidate states many additional responses but does not give a mandatory response. The flex rule was designed to allow the SMEs to assign a score of 3 to candidates who fail to give a mandatory response but who provide many additional responses. However, the SMEs cannot provide a score higher than a 3 in those cases. All mandatory responses must be given in order for a performance to be acceptable, whether there is one mandatory response or five of them. It is not assumed that candidates receive a score of 5 which is then lowered for lack of responses. Performances that include mandatory responses get a score of 3, and those without mandatory responses get a score of 1 or 2. Additional responses only increase a score from 3 to 4 or from 3 to 5.

At the end of every scenario and prior to the questions, instructions state, “In responding to the questions, make sure your actions directly relate to the scenario. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your score.” Question 1 asked for the use of proper radio protocols and giving an initial report, and question 2 asked for specific actions to take after the initial report. A review of the presentation reveals that the appellant gave an initial report, which was brief and did not include that there was a missing person or that he would use an offensive attack. In response to question 2, the appellant gave actions he would take. At one point, he stated that he had spread and collapse concerns due to a kitchen fire, the open-webbed bar joists, and the drop ceiling in the kitchen. He then stated, “With special consideration for the victim’s last known location being the kitchen, we begin our fire attack at this time, ah conducting an offensive attack.” While these actions acknowledge a missing person and an offensive attack, these considerations were not announced in the report to dispatch. Credit is not awarded for implied information given in a different context. The appellant missed a mandatory response, and his score cannot be higher than a 3.

## **CONCLUSION**

A thorough review of the appellant’s submissions and the test materials indicates that the decision below is amply supported by the record, and the appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this matter.

## **ORDER**

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
THE 29<sup>th</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2019



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers  
Director  
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Written Record Appeals Unit  
P. O. Box 312  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Michael Pelliccio  
Michael Johnson  
Records Center